



City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3009266
Applicant Name: Bradley Khouri
Address of Proposal: 1530 15th Avenue East

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a three-story, four-unit townhouse structure. Enclosed parking for four vehicles to be provided at grade. Demolition of an existing duplex.

The following approvals are required:

Administrative Design Review – Chapter 23.41 SMC.

*Early DNS Notice published June 4, 2009 and re-noticed April 27, 2011.

BACKGROUND DATA

Project Description

The applicant proposes a four unit townhouse clustered around a courtyard mid-block on the parallel streets, 15th Avenue East and Grandview Place East directly east of Lake View Cemetery. A small roughly 10' by 14' entry court with four townhouse units partially wrapped around it forms one of the projects organizing ideas (parti). The court faces south and lies approximately mid-way between the east and west property lines. Pedestrian access to the proposed court occurs along a five foot wide walkway connecting 15th Avenue E. to parking on the Grandview Place E. side of the development. A fence separates the walkway from the property to the south. The other idea, a contemporary vernacular style infill building updated with several green building accoutrements, has shed roofs (supporting one photovoltaic array), reclaimed wood siding in places, and an abstract composition of color and materials on the exterior.

The proposal has evolved from the Early Design Guidance stage. Notably the applicant has added a fourth townhouse unit and an associated parking space, increased the lot coverage with and without the proposed carport, enlarged the mass at the third floor, shifted access to parking from 15th Ave. E. to Grandview Place E., and added several departure requests for setbacks. In the early scheme, the shed roof hovered over some of the third floor roof decks and extended into a setback. The applicant further refined the project between Initial Recommendation and Final Recommendation reviews. Intrusions of the building mass into the side setbacks have been reduced or eliminated, a trellis leads to the entry court, parking is enclosed and a landscape plan explicitly defines the project's open spaces and edges.

Site and Vicinity Description

The rectangular shaped site comprises a total area of approximately 3,646 square feet in the northern extent of Capitol Hill. The development site owns a multifamily Lowrise Three (L3) zone classification.

The property, a through lot, with two parallel street frontages, lies mid-block along the east side of 15th Avenue East between East Garfield Street to the north and East Galer Street to the south. In addition, the site fronts on the west side of Grandview Place East. The site is located near the crown of Capitol Hill with views to the north and east to Lake Washington and the Cascade Mountain range. A single story residential structure with a daylight basement currently occupies the site. The remaining lot area is heavily landscaped with mature vegetation, typical of the surrounding area. The rights-of-way are improved with hard surface roadways and sidewalks along both frontages.

Zoning in the area is predominately residential, with multifamily Lowrise Three (L3) extending within a narrow zoning band for two blocks, between 15th Avenue and Grandview Pl., providing the highest concentration of residential density in the immediate vicinity. Outside this narrow band of lowrise residential zoning, the area becomes primarily a less intensive single family neighborhood with a Single Family 5,000 (SF 5000) zone classification. Well developed with residential structures, this area's housing stock, within the SF 5000 zone, is dominated by large homes. The development site sits between a two-story triplex to the north and a large four-story multifamily residential structure to the south. Directly across the street from the subject lot is Lake View Cemetery which abuts Volunteer Park, a Seattle Public Park to the south. The block front along 15th Ave. E. has a number of mature trees and landscaped open spaces. Due, in part, to the street alignment, both north and south streets serve Metro bus route number 10.

Most of the parking for residences and apartments along both sides of Grandview Place E. occurs within garages. The garages for the small properties are made of wood and in some cases have interesting details. The larger apartment or condominium buildings along Grandview Pl. have structured parking. The building to the south has a series of outdoor terraces built above the garage.

ANALYSIS-DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments

Nine letters were received during the EDG public comment period, their comments and clarifying questions focused on the following issues:

- Residents of adjacent properties would like to limit the width and location of curb cuts off Grandview to reduce the level of congestion within the right-of-way. On-street parking within Grandview is limited, any increase of units may inadvertently decrease the number of available on-street spaces.
- It is important that consideration be given to adjacent structures when establishing lot coverage, setbacks, building height, and open space, due in part to existing development patterns along the east side of 15th Avenue and along Grandview.
- Supports the design team's intention of building an energy-efficient, attractive project – it is an appropriate response to the community.
- Selection of trees and other landscaping in the planting strip on both sides is a concern.
- Concern that the proposed open walkway along the south property line may have negative impacts on security and noise levels.
- On-site parking should be increase above the minimum thresholds.
- Pushing residential density limits to the maximum allowed to should not be a consideration to accomplish a design that is out of scale with the neighborhood.
- Among other considerations, the proposal should be held to Design Review objectives.

Design Guideline Priorities

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents and hearing public comment, DPD design review staff provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's "*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*" of highest priority to this project.

The Department of Planning and Development has identified the guidelines below to be of highest priority for the architect as he continues to develop the design. In general, the design should attempt to activate the streetscape, with attention directed towards responsiveness to site area characteristics and to the design vernacular in the area, especially the specific features, such as roof lines, and impact of parking and access. The department is in support of the preferred triplex design scheme with modifications as identified below.

A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.

A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.

A-6 Transition between Residences and Street. For residential projects, the space between the building and sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.

A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive well-integrated open space.

A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties and pedestrian safety.

- The design should explore options that establish readable residential entries that are distinctive and attractive to the adjacent street system.
- The applicant is encouraged to install pavers or other treatments to soften parking courts and driveway.
- Parking and access should be relocated onto Grandview Avenue frontage to create a good pedestrian oriented street on 15th Ave. E. To the greatest extent, the design should de-emphasize vehicles in the parking area.
- The proposed building should make a bold statement at the street edge to strengthen its presence along the street.

B Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by , less-intensive zones.

- The design should be respectful to the adjacent buildings.

C Architectural Elements and Materials

C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complements the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its façade walls.

C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

- The proposed structure should provide features (i.e., modulation, materials, color, etc.) to add character, texture, and massing layers that create visual interest along the streetscape and side facade.
- Street level facades for the lower half of the structure should provide design themes that enhance pedestrian experiences along the right-of-way to create a fine scaled appearance of the building's bulk.

D Pedestrian Environment

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

D-2 Blank Walls. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of the structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

- Blank walls should be avoided whenever possible along all frontages.
- The design should optimize protecting the pedestrian experience within the right-of-way, and attention should be directed towards developing site triangles with attractive landscaping around the edges.

E Landscaping

E-3 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

- Where appropriate, landscaping should enhance the prior guidelines, by creating interesting and creative displays of hanging gardens and trellising at grade and above.

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on May 27, 2009.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review staff conducted two Recommendation reviews on June 14, 2011 and August 24, 2011 respectively to assess the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. Site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for staff's consideration.

Public Comments

Since MUP application intake, DPD received one letter and two phone calls commenting upon the proposal. The author prefers locating parking on Grandview Pl. E. to 15th Ave. E. The letter also complains of the trash left on the property by the tenants. Calls focused on extent of the building bulk and generous departure requests.

The City received additional letters at the time of Early Design Guidance reviewed earlier in this document.

A Site Planning

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.**

Relocating the parking from 15th Ave E. to Grandview Place E., where parking occurs for most other buildings on this block, is a welcome change and responds to the earlier guidance. (June 14, 2011)

DPD staff has no additional comments. (August 24, 2011)

- A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**

Both the placement of Unit #1's door facing 15th Ave and the appearance of the entry trellis from the right of way engages the townhouses with the streetscape. (August 24, 2011)

- A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

Only one entrance is truly apparent from the street. Side entrances add interest by extending the entry sequence deeper into a site. Success depends upon sightlines and building elements, or landscape features, which pull the pedestrian toward the entry, particularly when the entrances lack immediate visibility. Coordinated building and landscape designs can heighten this sense of passage by various techniques and arrangement of materials. Further development of the design needs to occur in order for the pathway and the court to work both functionally and aesthetically. See Guidance D-1, D-12, E-2. (June 14, 2011)

In response to the guidance above, the applicant has added a trellis along the south elevation leading to the shared entry court. Both the trellis and the wood plank walkway signal the pedestrian approach to the complex's common entry court. The vines growing on the trellis will add lushness to the side of the property to complement the generous plantings of the neighbor. (August 24, 2011)

- A-4 Human Activity. New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.**

A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.

The departure request to allow balcony projections in both side setbacks close to the property lines unnecessarily extends generous decks on the third level. On the north side, the adjacent building lies close to the shared property line. Preserving privacy and openness have intrinsic value to residents of the adjacent structure and of the future building. Although the condominium building to the south lies farther back from the property line than land use code requirements, maintaining privacy and reducing excesses of bulk on an infill property have merit beyond the rationale that extending a deck or balcony close to a property line would activate a central courtyard. Without the granting of the departure, the balcony would continue to overlook the entry courtyard.

The applicant chose to increase the number of units and bulk of the building between the EDG review and the MUP application. This increase has occurred both at levels one and two and at the third level in order to accommodate the added unit. Although departure request for setback averaging on the face of it seems small, it averages for the length of the building on a lot just 40 feet wide. It impacts the sense of openness in the corridor between the proposed building mass and that of the neighbor to the north. It also increases the mass bearing upon this open space. The request expands the bulk of the building; the rationale for the departure, as stated in the plans, does not explain how the proposal better meets the guidelines.

In the EDG packet, the applicant states that “to primarily benefit neighboring properties, we are proposing to shift nearly half the third floor massing down to the first two floors...Shifting the building mass is an elegant solution that mitigates neighbors’ views and massing concerns.” As shown in the EDG packet, the third floor mass represented roughly 64 percent of the mass of the lower two floors. Due to the expansion of the program, the third floor mass at MUP application represents an estimated 83 percent of the lower floor mass. This appears to belie the original intention of the applicant to ensure that massing benefits the neighboring properties.

The setbacks for this infill project should respect the norms established by the land use code. (June 14, 2011)

The portions of the balconies extending into the side setbacks have been removed. The applicant has rescinded this specific departure request. To ensure greater privacy, the applicant has altered the windows on the side elevations by using translucent surfaces in places. Fewer and smaller windows placed on the north and south elevations at the third level provide for more privacy.

The third floor remains smaller in bulk than the lower floors. The angling of the walls combined with the open spaces formed by the decks on the north and south elevation act to reduce the perception of bulk. A code conforming structure as to side setbacks could potentially have greater bulk than what is proposed. (August 24, 2011)

A-6 Transition Between Residence and Street. For residential projects, the space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.

See E-1 guidance. (June 14, 2011)

A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

The applicant requests a departure from residential open space for the four townhouse units. The distribution of open space at grade and on balconies and roof decks responds to the potential ways in which residents of townhouses make use of open space. For one of the units, the open space at the third floor engages the unit with the shared court. The applicant will need to provide DPD with 1) calculations illuminating the statistical discrepancy in open space that is requested, 2) a rationale for the decrease in open space that states how the decrease or the quality of open space better meets the guidelines (stating that the nearby location of public parks does not provide adequate justification that the proposal better meets or exceeds design guidelines), and 3) the design of specific open spaces should be refined according to the recommendations provided in D-1, E-1 and E-3. (June 14, 2011)

The residential open spaces have been refined with the applicant adding trellises, seating and generous amounts of plantings. The south entry court and the pathway linking to it provide a shared space for the residents. The terrace above the garage and the landscape along 15th Ave. E. has been upgraded to provide better continuity with the two streetscapes. (August 24, 2011)

A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.

The applicant has shifted the proposed parking from 15th Ave. E. to the Grandview Pl. E. frontage. (June 14, 2011)

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

Guidance provided in A-5 addresses issues of building bulk and its impact on neighboring properties. (June 14, 2011)
See A-5. (August 24, 2011)

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

Given the muted color palette and frequent use (although not preponderant) use of wood among the structures along 15th Ave. E., DPD prefers the 15th Ave. façade as illustrated in the Recommendation packet (dated May 27, 2009) and the original MUP drawings dated May and August 2009. See C-4. (June 14, 2011)

The applicant has responded to the earlier staff recommendation by adding mostly wood to the 15th Ave elevation and wrapping it around the corner and along the entry promenade. The bright red, cementitious panels visually counterbalance the wood on each of the facades and become the dominant motif on the three less exposed elevations. The predominance of the wood siding on the upper most level with its angled walls and mixture of roof forms suggest the more informal qualities of a tree house. (August 24, 2011)

- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.**

See C-4. (June 14, 2011)

- C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.**

- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.**

The composition of the recycled wood siding and the red hardiepanel siding appears arbitrary although, in some instances, it signifies a shift in plane. DPD prefers solutions that either emphasize the four separate townhouses or endows the third floor with the red paneling as set off from wood siding at the lower floors, or expresses the specialness of particular interior arrangements on the exterior. In sum, the relationship of the two major materials (and their colors) should read as a coherent statement to its residents and the casual pedestrian or visitor. (June 14, 2011)

See guidance for C-1 (August 24, 2011)

- C-5 Structured Parking Entrances. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.** The Land Use Code (SMC 23.45.018D) requires screening of parking from direct street view. Nearly all parking on Grandview Place is contained within garages. The one exception, a carport, shelters a large RV. DPD recommends that the parking for the four spaces be contained within a garage. (June 14, 2011)

The applicant has enclosed the parking. The garage will have a metal screen door providing security, light and air for the garage. (August 24, 2011)

D. Pedestrian Environment

- D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.**

The landscape plan shows trees planted within the walkway linking the “communal open space”. This should be revised. Lining the five foot pathway with containers seems to narrow unnecessarily the walkway. One solution is to create a trellis-like structure that would emphasize the pathway and open up the ground plane.

The plan for the court suggests that a small container garden with strawberry plants will serve as landscaping. If this is to be a truly communal area, the landscape plan should have benches or other forms of seating, a place where the resident could rest groceries while unlocking the door to his or her unit, and other types of landscaping that will promote social activity among the residents. (June 14, 2011)

The applicant has revised the plan for the major entry court and the pathway leading to it.

The plan illustrates a trellis above the pathway and the installation of seating and planters in the south facing entry court. The walkway will be more visible than previously described. (August 24, 2011)

D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

See Guideline C-5. The parking garage should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure or relate to the garages along the streetscape. Several of the garages have interesting detailing and decorative elements. (June 14, 2011)

Somewhat similar to the garage to the south, the proposed project will have terraces or decks above it. The garage door screen will resemble the doors of other garages along Grandview Place. (August 24, 2011)

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.

D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions. For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.

Little in the design of the walkway suggests that entries are located further down the path. The entry sequence from 15th Ave. E. should be welcoming and elegant; pulling the pedestrian into what ought to be a very special entry court. The design of the entry area

for the four units is prosaic. Based on the drawings, the doors lack detailing and landscaping is sparse. See E-2.

Unit #1's entrance on 15th Ave properly acknowledges the pedestrian oriented streetscape. The canopy should be deeper (currently 1.5') to shelter the user(s) from inclement weather. In the landscape plan, the entrance to Unit #2 on the north elevation does not lead to anywhere. No pathway links the entry to 15th Ave and a tree would block it. The applicant should either consider shifting the entry along the north wall toward 15th Ave to use as a formal entry or consider creating a garden area / walkway for access. (June 14, 2011)

The addition of a trellis and boardwalk along the entire entry pathway on the south side of the complex pulls the pedestrian toward the hidden court. A vertical green screen at the southeast corner of the entry court signals the court's location. The wood walkway, lush plantings and seating will potentially provide an intimate entry area for the residents and their guests.

The garden area for Unit #2 remains somewhat unresolved. Although it is clear that the designer does not attend to have a formal entry on the north side of the unit, it appears that the residents would step into an area lacking much definition. The planting of vine maples along the northern property line would likely preclude people from using the area as a pathway. (August 24, 2011)

E. Landscaping

E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites. Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.

The 15th Ave E. streetscape from E. Garfield to E. Galer has lush plantings, fencings (walls in one case) and rockeries that provide a pleasant pedestrian experience and create a gentle separation between public and private spaces. The applicant's landscape plan should be further developed to integrate the design of the front yard with the unity of the full streetscape. DPD recommends defining the open space for the two front units with either walls or fencing or hedges. (June 14, 2011)

The revision of the landscape plan illustrates a lush, native appearing habit of sword ferns and Japanese spurge between the structure and the right of way. (August 24, 2011)

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

Lipstick wild strawberry is generally used as a ground cover. DPD recommends placement of a specimen tree and/or a sculptural object to provide a focal point for the communal entry court.

Please provide specifications for containers and fencing as recommended in the paragraph above and in E-1. (June 14, 2011)

The applicant proposes grape fruiting vine on the trellis and Sedum Telephium on the green screen in the entry court. It is not clear whether the sedum will grow vine-like on a screen as shown in the entry court elevations. This applicant should clarify this. (August 24, 2011)

E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions. The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.

Terraces above Grandview Pl. have precedents along the west side of the street. The landscape plan indicates that the terrace above the parking will have a green roof. Plans also indicate that the terrace will also serve as open space for residents of Units # 3 and 4. If the intent is that the residents will use this open space for relaxation, dining and play, then the terrace ought to have a clearly defined seating or play area that extends the interior living space on that level. This design should recognize that tenants would likely desire a small paved area to enjoy their outdoor space. (June 14, 2011)

Revised landscape plans show a garden and sitting areas on the terrace or deck above the garage. (August 24, 2011)

Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans and models submitted on August 17th, 2011. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings available on August 17, 2011. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, Design Review staff recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below). DPD staff recommends the following CONDITIONS for the project. (Authority referred in the letter and number in parenthesis):

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	APPLICANT JUSTIFICATION	PRELIMINARY RECOM-MENDATION
1. Lot coverage. SMC 23.45.010A	Maximum lot coverage for townhouses is 50%.	Building: 52%. With attached garage lot coverage is 66.6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The enclosed garage represents a continuation of a pattern of enclosed garages on Grandview Ave. 	Approval
2. Structure depth. SMC 23.45.011A	Maximum building depth 65%.	69'4" or 76% of lot depth. With attached garage total depth is 86'1 3/4" or 95% of lot depth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building mass is reduced at the third level. Provides a green roof over the attached garage. Provides an entry court. 	Approval
3. Open Space SMC 23.45.016	An average of 300 sq. ft. of open space per unit. 1,200 sq. ft. total.	At grade, there is a total of 1,346 sq. ft. of open space. Only 484 sq. ft. meet dimensional and definitional regulations. At third level, there is an additional 282 sq. ft. of open space which do not meet definitional requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more open space than required. Provides novel spaces: large shared, entry court, "P" patch for use of tenants, 3rd floor deck visible from lower level open space. 	Approval.
4. Setbacks SMC 23.45.014	Front setback shall be the average of the setbacks of the first principal structures on either side. LR3 shall not be less than 5'.	On 15 th Ave E. the front setback equals 5'. The average setback for the adjacent buildings is 15'4 7/8". Front setback on Grandview Place E. is zero feet for the attached garage aligning with adjacent garage to the south. The building face setback is 16'9 3/4".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An unusual side entry and court on the south elevation replaces what would have been an entry area on 15th Ave. A portion of the garage is set below grade. Garage is similar to other garages along E. Grandview Pl. 	Approval
5. Setbacks SMC 23.45.014G	Structures in Required Setbacks. Arbors in each required setback may be erected with no more than a 40' s.f. footprint	A series of small arbors total 63 s.f. within the south, side setback. 23' additional s.f. of arbor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arbor signals the entry sequence leading to the courtyard. Plantings on the trellis contributes landscape buffer. 	Approval
6. Setbacks Table. SMC 23.45.014A	Side Setbacks. Required Lowrise zones average is 6'. Minimum is 5'	Minimum side setback for the structure is 5'. Average side setback is 5'7 1/2" on first and second floors of north side. Average on 3 rd floor is 7' 5". Average setback for all three floors is 6'3"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure steps back at 3rd level to reduce bulk and mass. Windows either frosted or placed to ensure privacy. Extensive landscaping in the side setbacks. 	Approval
7. Curb cuts. SMC 23.54.030	Curb cuts must not exceed a minimum width of 10 feet.	Curb cut to access four medium sized parking stall is 32' on Grandview Pl. E.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an enclosed garage. 	Approval
8. Sight Triangle. SMC 23.54.030	When the driveway is less than 10' from the property line, the sight triangle may be 5' from the property line.	Sight triangle is 3'6" wide to the north of the drive and 4'6" to the south.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grandview is a one-way street used like an alley. Traffic movement is slow. Provides an enclosed garage. 	Approval

The Board recommends the following **CONDITIONS** for the project. (Authority referred in the letter and number in parenthesis):

1. Ensure appropriate plantings are used at the southeast corner of the entry court to form a green screen. (C-2)

DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

The Director finds no conflicts with SEPA requirements or state or federal laws, and has reviewed the City-wide Design Guidelines and finds that DPD staff neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in the approval of this design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by DPD staff and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

CONDITIONS-DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Issuance of a Master Use Permit

1. Ensure appropriate plantings are used at the southeast corner of the entry court to form a green screen. (P)

During Construction

2. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the building contractor, building inspector, and land use planner to discuss expectations and details of the Design Review component of the project. (P)

Prior to Issuance of all Construction Permits

3. Embed the MUP conditions in the cover sheet for the MUP permit and for all subsequent permits including updated MUP plans, and all building permit drawings. (P)

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

4. Compliance with all images and text on the MUP drawings, design review guidance and approved design features and elements (including exterior materials, landscaping and ROW improvements) shall be verified by the DPD planner assigned to this project (Bruce P. Rips, 206-615-1392). An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least three (3) working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved. (P)

For the Life of the Project

5. Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site or must be submitted to DPD Design Review program for review and approval. (P)

Signature: Signature on File
Bruce P. Rips, AICP, AAIA
Department of Planning and Development

Date: September 22, 2011

BPR:
I:\RipsB\DOC\DESIGN REVIEW\DEC.3009266 1530 15TH Ave E.docx